

EXHIBIT I

1 Kathleen Sullivan (SBN 242261)
 2 kathleensullivan@quinnmanuel.com
 2 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
 3 SULLIVAN LLP
 3 51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
 4 New York, NY 10010
 4 Telephone: (212) 849-7000
 5 Facsimile: (212) 849-7100
 5
 6 Sean S. Pak (SBN 219032)
 6 seanpak@quinnmanuel.com
 7 John M. Neukom (SBN 275887)
 7 johnneukom@quinnmanuel.com.
 8 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
 8 SULLIVAN LLP
 9 50 California Street, 22nd Floor
 9 San Francisco, CA 94111
 10 Telephone: (415) 875-6600
 10 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700
 11
 12 Mark Tung (SBN 245782)
 12 marktung@quinnmanuel.com
 12 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
 13 SULLIVAN LLP
 13 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor
 14 Redwood Shores, CA 94065
 14 Telephone: (650) 801-5000
 15 Facsimile: (650) 801-5100
 15

16 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Cisco Systems, Inc.*

17 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

18 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

19 CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.,)	CASE NO. 5:14-cv-05344-BLF
20 Plaintiff,)	
21 v.)	
22 ARISTA NETWORKS, INC.,)	PLAINTIFF CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.'S
23 Defendant.)	SIXTH SUPPLEMENTAL
)	OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO
)	DEFENDANT ARISTA NETWORKS,
)	INC.'S FIRST SET OF
)	INTERROGATORIES (9 AND 10)

25
 26
 27
 28

1 burdensome in its use of the terms “used by anyone other than You,” “used by You,” and “who
 2 used those CLI Command(s) before You used them.” Cisco further objects to this interrogatory to
 3 the extent it seeks information that is protected by the attorney-client privilege, that constitutes
 4 attorney work-product, or that is protected by any other applicable privilege, protection, or
 5 immunity, including without limitation in connection with the common interest doctrine.

6 Subject to and without waiver of its general and specific objections, and to the extent this
 7 interrogatory can be understood, Cisco responds that after conducting a reasonable search it is not
 8 presently aware of any information responsive to this interrogatory. Cisco’s discovery efforts in
 9 this case are ongoing, and Cisco reserves the right to further supplement this response in light of
 10 facts learned during discovery, including information regarding Arista’s accused products.

11

12 **INTERROGATORY NO. 9:**

13 Identify and describe all facts that support Your description of any CLI Command(s) used
 14 by Cisco as “industry standard”, “industry” Command(s), “standard” Command(s), “common”
 15 Command(s) or other descriptions acknowledging or reflecting that others besides Cisco use the
 16 Command(s), and describe in detail why Cisco used such descriptions.

17

18 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 9:**

19 Cisco incorporates by reference its General Objections as though fully set forth herein.
 20 Cisco further objects to this interrogatory as irrelevant and not calculated to lead to the discovery
 21 of admissible evidence to the extent it (1) seeks information not relevant to the copyrightability of
 22 Cisco’s works-in-suit, and (2) seeks information regarding acts not at issue in this suit. Cisco
 23 further objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it assumes facts that are not in evidence,
 24 including that Cisco has ever described “any CLI Command(s) used by Cisco as ‘industry
 25 standard’, ‘industry’ Command(s), ‘standard’ Command(s), [or] ‘common’ Command(s)” or
 26 otherwise stated “that others besides Cisco use the Command(s).” Cisco also objects to this
 27 interrogatory as undefined, vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and unduly burdensome in its use of the
 28 terms “Your description,” “any CLI Command(s) used by Cisco,” and “why Cisco used such

1 descriptions.” Cisco further objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks information that is
 2 protected by the attorney-client privilege, that constitutes attorney work-product, or that is
 3 protected by any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity, including without limitation
 4 in connection with the common interest doctrine.

5 Subject to and without waiver of its general and specific objections, and to the extent this
 6 interrogatory can be understood, Cisco responds that after conducting a reasonable search it is not
 7 presently aware of any information responsive to this interrogatory, other than statements
 8 concerning Arista’s infringement of Cisco’s copyrighted works. With respect to the latter, Cisco
 9 incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein, its operative complaint and all documents
 10 cited therein, as well as its response to Interrogatory No. 2 above. Cisco’s discovery efforts in this
 11 case are ongoing, and Cisco reserves the right to further supplement this response in light of facts
 12 learned during discovery, including information regarding Arista’s accused products.

13

14 **SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 9:**

15 Subject to and without waiver of its general and specific objections, Cisco further responds
 16 as follows:

17 Arista has only identified a few instances of documents that use the term “standard” in
 18 connection with Cisco CLI. To the extent Cisco employees or representatives have referred in
 19 those documents to Cisco’s CLI as “standard” or “industry standard,” such references are clearly
 20 meant to convey the popularity of Cisco’s CLI in Cisco’s industry-leading products, and do not
 21 relate to any industry standards setting organizations.

22 Further, Arista’s assertions about these descriptions have no bearing on Arista’s liability
 23 for copying Cisco’s works: “[T]o the extent [an accused infringer] suggests that it was entitled to
 24 copy the [copyrighted materials] because they had become the effective industry standard, we are
 25 unpersuaded. [The accused infringer] cites no authority for its suggestion that copyrighted works
 26 lose protection when they become popular, and we have found none. In fact, the Ninth Circuit has
 27 rejected the argument that a work that later becomes the industry standard is uncopyrightable.”

28 *Oracle America, Inc. v. Google Inc.*, 750 F.3d 1339, 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2014).

1 Cisco's investigation of the subject matter of this interrogatory is ongoing. Cisco therefore
 2 reserves the right to supplement this response as additional information becomes available.
 3

4 **INTERROGATORY NO. 10:**

5 State in detail facts supporting Your contention in the December 5, 2014 "Protecting
 6 Innovation" post on the Cisco Blog that "Arista has copied more than 500 Cisco multi-command
 7 expressions, while networking products from HP, Brocade, Alcatel-Lucent, Juniper Networks and
 8 Extreme each only have a small fraction of overlapping CLI commands."

9

10 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 10:**

11 Cisco incorporates by reference its General Objections as though fully set forth herein.
 12 Cisco further objects to this interrogatory as irrelevant and not calculated to lead to the discovery
 13 of admissible evidence to the extent it seeks information regarding acts not at issue in this suit.
 14 Cisco also objects to this interrogatory as undefined, vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and unduly
 15 burdensome in its use of the terms "Your contention" and "the Cisco Blog." Cisco further objects
 16 to the characterization in this interrogatory that the quote contained in Interrogatory No. 10 is
 17 Cisco's contention. Cisco further objects to this interrogatory to the extent that it calls for
 18 information that is publicly available or equally available to Arista, and therefore is of no greater
 19 burden for Arista to obtain than for Cisco to obtain. Cisco further objects to this interrogatory on
 20 the grounds that it seeks information that is not within Cisco's possession, custody, or control and
 21 is not reasonably available to Cisco. Cisco further objects to this interrogatory to the extent it
 22 seeks information that is protected by the attorney-client privilege, that constitutes attorney work-
 23 product, or that is protected by any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity, including
 24 without limitation in connection with the common interest doctrine.

25 Subject to and without waiver of its general and specific objections, Cisco incorporates by
 26 reference, as if fully set forth herein, its operative complaint and all documents cited therein.
 27 Cisco further responds, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(d), that Cisco will produce documents
 28 containing information responsive to this interrogatory regarding third-party systems, which

1 DATED: November 11, 2015

Respectfully submitted,

2 /s/ Sean S. Pak
3

4 Kathleen Sullivan (SBN 242261)
5 kathleensullivan@quinnmanuel.com
6 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
7 SULLIVAN LLP
8 51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
9 New York, NY 10010
10 Telephone: (212) 849-7000
11 Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

12 Sean S. Pak (SBN 219032)
13 seancp@quinnmanuel.com
14 John M. Neukom (SBN 275887)
15 johnneukom@quinnmanuel.com.
16 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
17 SULLIVAN LLP
18 50 California Street, 22nd Floor
19 San Francisco, CA 94111
20 Telephone: (415) 875-6600
21 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

22 Mark Tung (SBN 245782)
23 marktung@quinnmanuel.com
24 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
25 SULLIVAN LLP
26 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor
27 Redwood Shores, CA 94065
28 Telephone: (650) 801-5000
Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

29 Steven Cherny (admitted *pro hac vice*)
30 steven.cherny@kirkland.com
31 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
32 601 Lexington Avenue
33 New York, New York 10022
34 Telephone: (212) 446-4800
35 Facsimile: (212) 446-4900

36 Adam R. Alper (SBN 196834)
37 adam.alper@kirkland.com
38 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
39 555 California Street
40 San Francisco, California 94104
41 Telephone: (415) 439-1400
42 Facsimile: (415) 439-1500

43 Michael W. De Vries (SBN 211001)
44 michael.devries@kirkland.com
45 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
46 333 South Hope Street
47 Los Angeles, California 90071

1 Telephone: (213) 680-8400
2 Facsimile: (213) 680-8500

3 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Cisco Systems, Inc.*

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROOF OF SERVICE

2 I hereby certify that, at the date entered below and per the agreement of the parties, I
3 caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing to be served by transmission via electronic mail,
4 made available to counsel at the email addresses below:

5 Juanita R. Brooks
6 brooks@fr.com
7 Fish & Richardson P.C.
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, CA 92130-2081

Brian L. Ferrall
blf@kvn.com
Michael S. Kwun
mkwun@kvn.com
David J. Silbert
djs@kvn.com
Robert Van Nest
rvannest@kvn.com
Keker & Van Nest LLP
633 Battery Street
San Francisco, CA 94111-1809

12 Ruffin B. Cordell
13 cordell@fr.com
14 Lauren A. Degnan
15 degnan@fr.com
16 Michael J. McKeon
17 mckeon@fr.com
18 Fish & Richardson PC
19 1425 K Street NW
20 11th Floor
21 Washington, DC 20005

19 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on
20 November 11, 2015, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ Peter Klivans

Peter Klivans